

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-37 are presently active in this case. The foregoing amendment amends Claims 1, 4, 5, 10-12, 14, and 16-18. Claims 19-37 are newly added. Aside from an amendment to change the dependency of Claim 14, only minor changes as to matters of form are made to Claims 1, 2, 5, 10-12, 14, and 16-18; and support for the amendment to the claims can be found in the original claims themselves. Newly added Claims 19-36 are method claims reciting a method corresponding to a method of using the apparatus recited in Claims 1-18, and description of the method of use is present throughout the detailed description. Claim 37 is a means plus function claim based on the features recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Title of the invention was objected to as not descriptive of the invention to which the claims are directed. Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Nozawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,805,272, hereafter, "Nozawa"), and Claims 1-13 and 17-18 were allowed.

Applicants note with appreciation the indication that Claims 1-13 and 17-18 are allowed.

Regarding the objection to the Title, the Title is amended to recite, "IMAGE INPUT APPARATUS USING PROJECTED LIGHT." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the Title.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 14-16 as anticipated by Nozawa, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Claim 14 is amended to depend from Claim 1. As Claim 1 was indicated as allowable in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claim 14 is

allowable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 1, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Amended Claims 15 and 16 indirectly depend from Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 15 and 16 patentably distinguish over Nozawa for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 15-16.

Regarding newly added Claims 19-36, Applicants respectfully submit that the method recited in these claims is the method that would be performed in the operation the apparatus recited in Claims 1-18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that newly added Claims 19-36 patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claims 1-18.

Regarding newly added Claim 37, Applicants respectfully submit that the features of newly added Claim 37 are substantially similar to the features recited in Claim 1 written in "means plus function" form. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that newly added Claim 37 patentably distinguishes over the cited reference for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Consequently, in light of the above-discussion and in view of the present amendments, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
GJM/SS/LS



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record